

## FINANCE DEPARTMENT

The 6th August, 1970

No. 3081-B&C-70/21587.—The Governor of Haryana is pleased to constitute an adhoc Committee consisting of the following to take measures for improvement of the receipts of the Departments during the financial year 1970-71:—

(1) Financial Commissioner, Revenue Haryana	Chairman
(2) Commissioner for Home Affairs and Secretary to Government Haryana, Home Department	Member
(3) Commissioner for Planning and Finance and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Planning and Finance Departments	Do
(4) Commissioner for Revenue and Secretary to Government Haryana, Revenue and Excise & Taxation Departments	Do
(5) Commissioner for Education and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Education, Health and Local Government Departments.	Do
(6) Excise and Taxation Commissioner, Haryana	Do

2. Deputy Secretary to Government, Haryana, Finance (Budget) Department, will act as Secretary of the Committee.

3. The Committee would submit its report to Government within two months of its constitution.
4. The Committee may co-opt representatives of other Departments, whenever necessary.
5. The Committee will meet according to the requirements of the transaction of its work and three members present will form the quorum of the meeting.
6. The Headquarters of the Committee will be at Chandigarh.

ISHWAR CHANDRA,

Commissioner for Planning and Finance and Secy.

## CORR/GENDUM

Notification No. 181-TA—HR(IT)-70/321, dated the 23rd April, 1970, first line, please read H. R. GROVER

In HARYANA GOVERNMENT GAZETTE, dated 5th May, 1970, Part I, Page 331, Finance Department, instead of A. R. GROVER.

In Notification No. FD-DOL(HR)70/7536, dated the 21st July, 1970,

In Rule 7 (i) read "Seven" in place of the word "Five".

In Rule 7 (ii) read "Nine" in place of the word "Seven".

J. R. DHINGRA,

Director of Lotteries-cum-Deputy Secy.

## LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 7th August, 1970

No. 6841-ILab-70/23148.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal Haryana, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Aggarwal Flour Mills Nai Mandi, Karnal.

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD.

Reference No. 71 of 1970

between

Shri Gopi Ram workman and the management of M/s Aggarwal Flour Mills, Nai Mandi, Karnal  
Present.—

Shri Harbans Lal for the workman.

Shri Ugger Sain for the management.

## AWARD

Shri Gopi Ram was serving as a Chakki Fitter in M/s Aggarwal Flour Mills, Nai Mandi, Karnal. His services were terminated and this gave rise to an industrial dispute. According to the Governor of Haryana in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication, -*vide* Government Gazette. Notification No. ID/9787, dated the 3rd April, 1970

Whether the termination of services of Shri Gopi Ram, Chakki Fitter is justified and in order; If not to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the parties in response to which a statement of claim was filed on behalf of the aggrieved workman and the management filed their written statement. It is however not necessary to decide the case on merits because a compromise has been arrived at between the parties. The workman has agreed to accept Rs. 722 in full and final settlement of all his claim including the claim for reinstatement. The management have agreed to pay this amount to the workmen within a few days. In view of the settlement arrived at between the parties the workman is not entitled to any further relief. I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Dated 25th July, 1970

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 1144, dated the 29th July, 1970

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to the Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Dated 25th July, 1970

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 6837-1Lab-70/23151.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Busching Schmity (P) Ltd., Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI P.N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,  
FARIDABAD

Reference No.25 of 1970

*between*

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BUSCHING SCHMITY (P) LTD ;  
FARIDABAD

*Present* :—

Shri Darshan Singh, for the workmen.

Shri S. L. Gupta, for the management.

## AWARD

The workmen of M/s. Busching Schmity (P) Ltd., Faridabad raised a number of demands, -*vide* their notice of demands, dated 26th September, 1969. The Governor of Haryana, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication, -*vide* Government Gazette Notification No. ID FD 479 A/4126, dated 13th February, 1970.

"Whether the grades and scales of the workmen be fixed. If so ; with what details and from which date ?"

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the parties. It is however not necessary to decide the case on merits because an amicable settlement have been arrived at between the parties. The terms of settlement have been incorporated in detail in the deed of settlement which is annexure 'A' to this award. The correctness of settlement is admitted by Shri Darshan Singh who represents the workmen as also by Sh. S. L. Gupta who represents the management. Their statements have been recorded. After hearing the representative of the parties, I am of the opinion that the terms of settlement are fair and reasonable. I gave my award in terms of the settlement between the parties which would be deemed to be a part of this award.

No order as to cost.

Dated 19th July, 1970.

P. N. THUKRAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 1136, dated Faridabad 28th July, 1970

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated 19th July, 1970.

P. N. THUKRAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

#### Settlement between the Management and Workmen of M/s Busching Schmitz (P) Ltd., Faridabad

*Representing Employer* :—Sardar Mandhir Singh, Works Manager.

*Representing Workmen* :—All workmen of the Factory represented by those whose signatures are given hereunder.

Whereas an Industrial dispute exists between the parties and whereas a reference No. 25 of 1970 is pending with the Hon'ble Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad. The parties have mutually settled the dispute as per the terms mentioned here under:—

1. The Employer agrees to pay to the workmen all inclusive minimum rates of the wages per mensem in general as notified in the Haryana Govt. Labour Department Notification, dated 4th February, 1970 in so far as the categories of workmen employed by the Employer are concerned and detailed below in particular. These rates of wages will have effect from 6th February, 1970.
2. The Employer agrees to pay to the workmen arrears arising out of Clause (1) if any.
3. The Employer agrees to pay them the following grades in particular and further agrees to grant annual increments to the workmen at the rates mentioned against each:—

Serial No.	Categories of Employees	All inclusive minimum rates of wages per mensem	Annual increment per mensem
		Rs	Rs
<b>UNSKILLED</b>			
1.	Sweeper		
2.	Watchman		
3.	Yard Mazdoor		97.00
4.	General Helper		4.00
5.	Store Mazdoor		
6.	Peon		

Serial No.	Categories of Employees	All inclusive minimum rates of wages per mensem	Annual increment per mensem
		Rs	Rs
<b>SEMI-SKILLED "A"</b>			
<b>(a) Tools Room/Machine Shop</b>			
1. Turner Grade III			
2. Driller Grade II			
3. Reamer Grade II		110.00	4.50
4. Shaperman Grade III			
5. Machine Man			
6. Machinist Grade II			
<b>(b) Smithy and Fabricating Trades</b>			
1. Welder Grade I			
2. Tin Smith Grade I			
3. Hammerman Grade I		120.00	5.00
4. Blacksmith Grade II			
<b>(c) Electrician Grade II</b>			
1. Electrician Grade II			
2. Armature Winder and Coil Winder Grade II		120.00	5.00
<b>SKILLED "A"</b>			
<b>(a)</b>			
1. Turner Grade I			
2. Grinding Machine Operator Grade I			
3. Shaperman Grade I		145.00	6.00
4. Miller Grade I			
<b>(b) Metal Finishing and Processing Trades</b>			
1. Grinder Grade II			
2. Polishman		110.00	4.50
3. Bufferman			
<b>(c) Fitter and Die Fitters and Pattern Maker Trades</b>			
1. Fitter Grade III			
2. Carpenter Grade III		110.00	4.50
3. Die Maker Grade III			
<b>(d) Smithy and Fabrication Trades</b>			
1. Welder Grade II			
2. Tin Smith Grade II			
3. Hammerman Grade II		110.00	4.50
4. Pipe Bender			

Serial No.	Categories of Employees	All inclusive minimum rates of wages per mensem	Annual increment per mensem
		Rs	Rs
SEMI-SKILLED "B"			
<b>(a) Tool Room—Machine Shop</b>			
1. Turner Grade II			
2. Driller Grade I			
3. Shaperman Grade I		120.00	5.00
4. Machinist Grade II			
<b>(b) Fitter &amp; Die Fitter &amp; Pattern Maker Trades</b>			
1. Fitter Grade I			
2. Carpenter/Pattern Maker Grade I			
3. Die-maker Grade I		145.00	6.00
4. Engraver Grade II			
5. Tools Setter Grade I			
<b>(c) Smithy &amp; Fabricating Trades</b>			
1. Blacksmith Grade I		145.00	6.00
<b>(d) Electrician Trades</b>			
1. Electrician Grade I		145.00	6.00
1. (e) Viewer/Inspector Grade I		145.00	6.00
SKILLED "B"			
<b>(a) Tool Room/Machine Shop</b>			
1. Turner Skilled			
2. Grinding Machine Operator, Skilled		160.00	7.00
3. Miller, Skilled			
<b>(b) Fitter &amp; Die Fitters &amp; Pattern Maker, Trades</b>			
1. Fitter, Skilled			
2. Carpenter/Pattern Maker, Skilled		160.00	7.00
3. Die Maker, Skilled			
<b>(c) Smithy &amp; Fabricating Trades</b>			
1. Blacksmith Skilled		160.00	7.00
CLERICAL STAFF			
1. Clerks (Non-Matic)		100.00	5.00
2. Clerks (Matic/Despatch Clerk)		120.00	5.00
3. Storekeeper/Clerk Graduate/Storekeeper Typist		150.00	6.00

(4) The annual increments will accrue with effect from the date on which a workman will complete twelve months qualifying and satisfactory services.

(5) These rates of wages and annual increments herein agreed to will also be applicable to the workmen who might have been engaged on or after 6th February, 1970, or may be engaged after signing of this agreement.

(6) The workmen hereby withdraw all demands referred to in the above reference No. 25 of 1970 pending with the Industrial Tribunal.

The parties sign the settlement having accepted its terms this 20th day of June, 1970, at Faridabad.

<i>For Workmen</i>	<i>Witnesses</i>	<i>For Employer</i>
1. (Sd) (Bhola Singh).	1. (Sd) . . .	(Sd) . . .
2. (Sd) (Nathi Ram).		
3. (Sd) (Dalan Singh).	2. (Sd) . . .	
4. (Sd) (Shivcharan Lal).		for Busching Schmitz, Private Limited.
5. (Sd) (Illegible).		

No. 6840-IL-1b-70/23153.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman Shri Lachhman Dass and the management of M/s Laxmi Rattan Engineering Works, Faridabad.

**BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD**

**Reference No. 90 of 1969**

*Between*

**SHRI LACHHMAN DASS, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S LAXMI  
RATTAN ENGINEERING WORKS, FARIDABAD**

*Present.—*

Shri Darshan Singh with Shri Lachhman Dass, concerned workman.

Shri R.C. Sharma with Shri A. P. Jain, for the management.

**AWARD**

Shri Lachhman Dass was in the service of M/s Laxmi Rattan Engineering Works, Faridabad. His services were terminated and this gave rise to an industrial dispute. Accordingly the Governor of Haryana, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication,—*vide* Government Gazette notification No. ID/FD/15P/34933, dated 29th December, 1969.

Whether the termination of services of Shri Lachhman Dass, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the parties in response to which the management filed their written statement raising a number of preliminary objections which were, however, subsequently given up. On merits the only issues which arose from the pleadings of the parties was precisely the same as in the order of reference.

It is, however, not necessary to decide the case on merits because a compromise have been arrived at between the parties. It is agreed that Shri Lachhman Dass would be considered as discharged from service and he would get compensation which is paid to the retrenched workers under section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act. It is also agreed that he would get one month salary in lieu of notice if not already paid to him under section 33 (2) (b) of the Industrial Disputes Act and he would also be entitled to his learned wages and leave wages if any due to him. The workmen has given up his right for reinstatement or re-employment. The management agreed to make the payment by 10th August, 1970.

The statements of the representative of the management and that of the aggrieved workman have been recorded. They have admitted the correctness of the terms of the compromise which appear to be fair and reasonable. I accordingly give my award in terms of the settlement between the parties. No order as to cost.

Dated 25th July, 1970.

P. N. THUKRAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 1146, dated 29th July, 1970.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 25th July, 1970.

P. N. THUKRAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

The 11th August, 1970

No. 1Lab-70/23492.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Rohtas Saw Mills, Industrial Area, Yamunanagar.

**BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD.**

REFERENCE NO. OF 23 1969

between

**THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M S ROHTAS SAW MILLS. INDUSTRIAL AREA,  
YAMUNA NAGAR**

*Present*.—

Shri Madhu Sudan Saran Cowshish for the workmen. Nemo for the management.

#### AWARD

The workmen of M/s Rohtas Saw Mills, Industrial Area, Yamuna Nagar through Ara Mill Mazdoor Union, Registered, served a notice of demand on the management that the lay off declared by them with effect from 7th October, 1968 was illegal and uncalled for. It was demanded that the workmen be paid full wages for the period of their so called lay off. This demand was not accepted and this gave rise to an industrial dispute. Accordingly the Governor of Haryana, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following disputes to this Tribunal, for adjudication,—vide Government Gazette Notification No. 1D/UMB/7-C/13268, dated 8th May, 1969.

Whether the action of the management in not providing work to the following workmen during the period noted against each was justified and in order. If not, to what relief are they entitled.

1. Shri Chanan Dass
2. Shri Des Raj
3. Shri Raj Kumar
4. Shri Gajey Singh

7th October, 1968 to 16th November, 1968,

Ditto

Ditto

28th September, 1968 to 16th November, 1968

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the parties for 23rd July, 1969. On the date fixed Shri Madhu Sudan Saran Cowshish was present on behalf of the workmen and Shri Amar Nath Ghai Partner of the respondent concerned with Shri Gulzari Lal Sharma was present on behalf of the management. An objection was raised on behalf of the workmen that Shri Gulzari Lal Sharma could not appear on behalf of the management. It was ordered that the grounds on which the objection had been raised be given and the reply be filed on 11th September, 1969. The court could not be held at Yamuna Nagar on the date fixed and a number of notices were then issued to the parties for attending the Court on the next dates fixed for the hearing of the case but service could not be effected. The service of the parties was ultimately effected for 16th July, 1969 but no body appeared although I waited for them till 12-20 p. m. As the Court time was from 7 a. m. to 1-30 p. m. it was not considered necessary to wait further.

Since the workmen have led no evidence in support of their demand. I hold that they are not entitled to any relief. I give my award accordingly. No order as to cost.

Dated 27th July, 1970

P. N. THUKRAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 1145, dated the 29th July, 1970

Forwarded (Four copies) to the Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Dated 27th July, 1970.

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

The 12th August, 1970

**No. 1Lab-70/23618.**—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Palvariser Grinding Mills, Fatehpur Chandela, Railway Road, Faridabad.

**BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD**

**Reference No. 5 of 1970**

*between*

**THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S PALVARISER GRINDING MILLS,  
FATEHPUR CHANDELA, RAILWAY ROAD, FARIDABAD**

*Present.*

Shri Roshan Lal, for the workmen.

Shri S. N. Taneja, for the management.

#### AWARD

Shri Kalu Ram was in service of M/s Palvariser Grinding Mills, Fatehpur Chandela, Railway Road, Faridabad. According to the workman his services were terminated without giving him any prior notice or giving him any opportunity to show cause and therefore, the action of the management terminating his services was not justified. The workman raised an industrial dispute and the same was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication, — *vide* Government Gazette Notification No. ID FD/448-A/452, dated 7th January, 1970.

"Whether the termination of services of Shri Kalu Ram was justified and in order. If not to what relief is he entitled?"

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the parties in response to which a statement of claim was filed on behalf of the workman and the management filed their written statement. The case of the management is that the respondent concern is a very small unit employing not more than three persons and is not incorporated under the Companies Act and is not even registered under the Factories Act. It is pleaded that no formal appointment letters are given to the workmen and if they do not work properly no charge sheets etc. are issued to them. It is alleged that the workmen are expected to work as per the instructions of the proprietor. However, no objection was taken that the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was not applicable to the facts of the present case or that the reference was not valid. So no issue was framed to cover these objections.

As regards the merits of the case the workman in the statement of claim did not suggest any reason as to why the management had terminated his services. The written statement filed on behalf of the management too has been drafted in a very artistic manner and does not state why the workman was dismissed. It therefore became necessary to record the statement of Shri S. N. Taneja who was appearing on behalf of the management in order to ascertain the stand of the management before framing issues. Shri Taneja stated that the workman Shri Kalu Ram joined them on 1st July, 1967 and he worked for about 1½ years out of which his work was satisfactory for about a year and then he proceeded on leave. Shri Taneja stated that workman returned after about two months and thereafter did not work properly. He twice put the machine out of order and did not improve his work though he was warned and so his services were terminated. It is stated that he was taken back in service on the intervention of the Conciliation Officer but he again started misbehaving and abusing the proprietor and so his services were terminated with effect from 4th May, 1967.

In view of the statement of Shri S. N. Taneja clarifying the stand of the management and the allegations of the workman in this claim statement that his dismissal was wrongfull the only issue which arise from the pleadings of the parties was precisely the same as in the order of the reference. The parties were given an opportunity to produce evidence in support of their respective contentions. Shri Paras Ram Proprietor of the respondent concern appeared as a witness on behalf of the management. In rebuttal Shri Kalu Ram workman appeared as a witness in support of his

case. It is admitted on behalf of the management that before terminating the services of the workman no opportunity was given to him to show cause as to why his services be not terminated and for this reason the original order of dismissal must be held to be invalid but on merits I am of the opinion that the workman is not entitled to the relief of re-instatement. It is proved by the evidence of Shri Paras Ram, Proprietor of the respondent concern that the behaviour of Shri Kalu Ram became intolerable and his work was wholly unsatisfactory. According to Shri Paras Ram, the workman used to break the parts of the machine intentionally and put it out of order and he also incited other workmen not to do their work. I do not consider I believe this because in cross examination the only suggestion given to the witness is that Shri Kalu Ram had been in the service of the respondent factory for about six years and that his services had been terminated because of his trade union activities and raising slogan etc., at the gate of the factory. The witness denied all these suggestions. According to the workman he had been in the service of the management for six years and not only for 1½ years as stated by the witness if so it should not have been difficult for the workman to prove this fact by summoning the account books and other relevant records for the purposes of proving the period for which he had been in the service of the management. Except his own word of mouth the workman did not produce any other evidence on this point. Secondly the workman wants Tribunal to believe that the management were aggrieved because of his trade union activities and one of his activity was that he raised a demand for bonus and raised slogans at the gate of the factory. The circumstances of the case show that neither of these reasons could be correct as already pointed out the stand taken up by the management is that the respondent concern is a very small establishment hardly employing three persons while according to the workmen the management were employing about fifteen persons. If the management were really employing about fifteen persons the workman could have easily proved this fact by summoning the relevant records of the management but here too the workman wants the Court to rely upon his oral version only. It is not possible to place any reliance on the oral version of the workman because it is not possible to believe that the workman who poses as an active trade unionist should forget the names of his co-workers. In cross examination the workman has been able to give the names of only four of his co-worker and about the rest he says that he does not remember their names. Secondly if any demand for bonus was actually raised a copy of the demand notice could have been got summoned from the office of the conciliation Officer. But here also we have only the oral version of the workman alone which does not appear to be satisfactory. The Basel's suggestion given by the workman indirectly lends strength to the version of the management that the workman started behaving in a mischievous way and his services had to be terminated. The proper course for the management was to have framed a charge sheet against the workman and given him an opportunity to defend himself before terminating his service. Since the management did not comply with the mandatory provisions of law before terminating the services of the workmen he is entitled to his wages till the date of the award. In this connection I rely upon Shri Soonwala, who in his learned commentary on Industrial Law 1966 addition which is based upon the decision of the Supreme Court has observed at page 872 that "a distinction has to be made depending upon whether an enquiry was held but was defective or whether no enquiry has been held at all. In the formal case the approval of the Tribunal relates back to the date of the order of dismissal itself and the workman has no right to his wages after that date but in the later case the dismissal can take effect only from the date of the award and the workmen can claim his wages till that date even though the order of dismissal made by the employer is approved." This view is based upon the Supreme Court decision in Sasana Sugar Works Private Ltd. Versus Shobrata Khan and reported in A.I.R. 1959—Supreme Court 923. Following this view I hold that the workman would be entitled to his wages up to the date of this award.

P. N. THUKRAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Dated, 27th July, 1970.

No. 1147, dated 29th July, 1970

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Dated 27th July, 1970.

B. L. AHUJA,  
Commissioner for Labour and Employment,